

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

6 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

7  
8 TAHA ABOURAMADAN

Case No. 2:12-cv-01625-LDG-NJK

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 A-LINK WIRELESS NV, LLC, JUDE  
12 KOURDIE, COLBY RANDALL, DANIELLE  
LAURIA, RICCIARDELLI WRIGHT

13 Defendant.

14  
15 This matter comes before the Court on: Plaintiff Taha Abouramadan's Motion to  
16 Dismiss (#43), Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (#25, 41), and Defendants' Motions for  
17 Summary Judgment (#46, 48, 50).

18 I. BACKGROUND

19 Plaintiff *pro se* Taha Abouramadan filed his original Complaint on July 24, 2012. In an  
20 amended Complaint, plaintiff named as defendants AT&T Mobility, LLC dba Telecomm  
21 Mobile Group LLC, dba A-Link Wireless, Jude Kourdie, Colby Randall, Danielle Lauria, and  
22 Ricciardelli Wright. In response to a petition by A-Link Wireless NV, LLC, this Court granted  
23 removal from Clark County District Court to the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada  
24 on September 14, 2012 (#1).

25 A-Link Wireless NV, LLC, erroneously sued as AT&T Mobility, LLC dba Telecomm  
26 Mobile Group, LLC dba A-Link Wireless, moved for a More Definite Statement or

1 Alternatively Motion to Dismiss on November 8, 2012 (#25). Abouramadan did not  
2 respond, and A-Link Wireless filed a Notice of Non-Opposition (#28).

3 The Court granted the stipulation of dismissal of co-defendant AT&T Mobility II, LLC,  
4 erroneously sued as AT&T Mobility, LLC dba Telecomm Mobile Group, LLC dba A-Link  
5 Wireless, on April 16, 2013 (#37).

6 Defendants A-Link Wireless NV, LLC, Jude Kourdie, Colby Randall, Danielle Lauria,  
7 and Ricciardelli Wright moved to Dismiss For Failure to Prosecute Claims and/or Comply  
8 with the Court Rules and Orders on May 10, 2013 (#41).

9 Plaintiff moved for Dismissal of Entire Action Without Prejudice on May 21, 2013  
10 (#43). Defendants A-Link Wireless NV, LLC, Jude Kourdie, Colby Randall, Danielle Lauria,  
11 and Ricciardelli Wright, responded, but requested that dismissal of the entire action be with  
12 prejudice because plaintiff failed to take necessary steps to prosecute his case in a timely  
13 manner (#44).

14 Defendants A-Link Wireless NV, LLC, Jude Kourdie, Colby Randall, Danielle Lauria,  
15 and Ricciardelli Wright later moved for Summary Judgment on July 7, 2013 (#46) in favor of  
16 defendant Telecomm Mobile Group LLC, erroneously named in the present suit. Next,  
17 defendants A-Link Wireless NV, LLC, Jude Kourdie, Colby Randall, Danielle Lauria, and  
18 Ricciardelli Wright moved for Summary Judgment on July 17, 2013 (#48) in favor of  
19 defendants Jude Kourdie, Colby Randall, Danielle Lauria, and Ricciardelli Wright. Finally,  
20 defendants A-Link Wireless NV, LLC, Jude Kourdie, Colby Randall, Danielle Lauria, and  
21 Ricciardelli Wright moved for Summary Judgment on July 17, 2013 (#50) in favor of  
22 defendant A-Link Wireless NV, LLC.

23  
24 II. DISMISSAL BY THE COURT

25 According to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(2) an order of dismissal at the request of the  
26 Plaintiff is appropriate at the court's discretion unless an existing counterclaim by a

1 defendant who objects to the dismissal will remain pending. The court may require that  
2 dismissal be with prejudice. *See Burnette v. Godshall*, 828 F. Supp. 1439, 1443 (N.D.Cal.  
3 1993), *aff'd sub nom., Burnette v. Lockheed Missiles & Space Co.*, 72 F.3d 766 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995).

4  
5 III. CONCLUSION

6 The plaintiff requests this case be dismissed. Since the plaintiff has indicated that  
7 dismissal is appropriate because he entered an agreement with AT&T Mobility II, LLC  
8 whereby he received payment for previously unpaid wages,

9 IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss (#43) is GRANTED with prejudice.

10 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff and Defendant shall pay their own attorney's fees.

11 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (#25, 41) are DENIED as  
12 moot because this court has dismissed the entire action as against any and all potential  
13 defendants named in the amended complaint.

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment (#46, 48, 50) are  
15 DENIED as moot because this court has denied the entire action as against any and all  
16 potential defendants named in the amended complaint.

17  
18 DATED this 9 day of August, 2013.

19  
20   
Lloyd D. George  
United States District Judge